

NEW YORK HERALD

BROADWAY AND ANN STREET.

JAMES GORDON BENNETT,
PROPRIETOR.

NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.—On and after January 1, 1875, the daily and weekly editions of the New York Herald will be sent free of postage.

THE DAILY HERALD, published every day in the year. Four cents per copy. Annual subscription price \$12.

All business or news letters and telegraphic despatches must be addressed New York Herald.

Rejected communications will not be returned.

Letters and packages should be properly sealed.

LONDON OFFICE OF THE NEW YORK HERALD—NO. 46 FLEET STREET.

Subscriptions and advertisements will be received and forwarded on the same terms as in New York.

VOLUME XL.....NO. 83

AMUSEMENTS THIS AFTERNOON AND EVENING.

FIFTH AVENUE THEATRE.
Twenty-eighth street and Broadway.—THE BIG BOSS, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

LYCEUM THEATRE.
Forty-fourth street and Broadway.—MARRIAGE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—DAVE CROCKETT, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GRAND CENTRAL THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BOOTH'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

SAN FRANCISCO MINSTRELS.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TIVOLI THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

WALLACK'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

MRS. CONWAY'S BROOKLYN THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

WOODS MUSEUM.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

OLYMPIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

ROBINSON HALL.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BROOKLYN PARK THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

BRANT'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

GERMANIA THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

NIBLO'S THEATRE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

TONY PASTOR'S OPERA HOUSE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

THEATRE COMIQUE.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

METROPOLITAN MUSEUM OF ART.
Broadway.—THE FIFTH AVENUE, at 8 P. M.; at 10:30 P. M. Mr. Fisher, Mr. Lewis, Miss Davenport, Mrs. Gilbert.

Partisan Carping at Andrew Johnson.

Readers of the comments of the party newspapers on Mr. Johnson's speech must have got a distorted view unless they read the speech itself. The partisan editors try to convey the impression that it was an incoherent outpouring of personal egotism and of vituperation against President Grant, whereas it was, in fact, a strong, pertinent argument, too diffuse, no doubt, but bearing as closely on the question as any speech that has been delivered in this debate, and a great deal more so than most of them. We can recall no topic or line of illustration which was not strictly relevant, except the impropriety of receiving gifts by public officers. All his other points came in naturally, and several of them had not been made before in the course of the discussion. The party journals complain that so much of the speech is devoted to criticism of the President. We wish the cavillers would tell us why this was out of place when the very question before the Senate was the proposed passage of a resolution endorsing the President's course in Louisiana. This question has but two sides—whether the President shall be endorsed or shall not be endorsed; and the discussion necessarily involves eulogy, or, at least, apology, by the advocates of the resolution, and condemnation of the course of the President by its opponents. The conduct of the President was the very subject under debate, and it is preposterous to complain of Senator Johnson for confining his remarks to the question. And yet he is criticised in a tone as if he had wandered from the business before the Senate and launched forth into irrelevant invectives against the President on an occasion to which they were not related.

Neither is it true that the speech is made up of violent invective and personal abuse. On the contrary, although Mr. Johnson's language is explicit, it was strictly parliamentary and decorous. The most devoted supporter of President Grant on the floor, if he had kept watch for that purpose, could not have found an occasion for calling Mr. Johnson to order. He was vigorous and earnest, for that is a part of his character; but his hard hitting did not consist in vulgar language and coarse epithets, but in the force of his well aimed arguments. It is unjust and absurd to represent this as a low, ill-toned speech. Its language bears, indeed, no marks of careful preparation and has something of the crudeness incident to extemporaneous speaking, and, being transmitted at once by telegraph without revision, fairness requires that it should be judged by the force and pertinence of its reasoning, since its language, however unscholarly, nowhere offends against parliamentary propriety.

Another partisan animadversion on this really good speech is its alleged egotistical recitals of parts of Mr. Johnson's personal and official history. This charge has a deceptive color of plausibility, but no substantial foundation. It is true that Mr. Johnson supports his argument by two references to his own administration, but we should pity the intellect of any man who would venture to say that they are not pertinent to the question before the Senate. They are, in truth, the most pertinent illustrations that could have been selected by any speaker. Where else, indeed, can General Grant look for precedents in this class of difficulties but in the administration of his immediate predecessor? The reconstruction question and the collateral questions connected with it first came into the foreground of our politics in the beginning of President Johnson's administration. When President Grant was elevated to the head of the government there was no other part of our history to which he could have recourse for guidance in dealing with the Southern States, because Johnson was the first Chief Magistrate called to deal responsibly with this kind of difficulties. If Mr. Johnson buttressed his argument with precedents at all he was compelled to take them from his own administration, the only part of our history where they could be found. The fact that other speakers had omitted them was a reason for their introduction, if they tended to throw light on the question. They are really the most valuable contribution which has been made in this debate to a discussion which is so stale in most of its aspects. The reason why other speakers have not referred to them is obvious. They make against the republican side, and the democratic debaters avoided them from an unmanly fear that citing Andrew Johnson as an authority would in some way commit them to his unpopular administration. It was, therefore, entirely proper for Mr. Johnson to call attention to them himself if they really elucidated the subject, and a charge of egotism on this account is a shallow flimsy unworthy of serious journalism.

The two cases which Mr. Johnson cites from his own administration are truly instructive. The Tennessee case, in 1866, bears a close resemblance to the Louisiana case at the beginning of this year. General Thomas—then in command at Nashville—applied to General Grant at Washington for military assistance to enable the Union men of Tennessee to organize the State Legislature. The despatch came through the War Department to the President, and Mr. Johnson directed instructions to be sent to General Thomas forbidding him to interfere. "The administration of the laws," he telegraphed, "and the preservation of the peace in Nashville belong properly to the State authorities, and the duty of the United States authorities is not to interfere in any way in the controversy between the public authorities of the State, and General Thomas will strictly abstain from any interference between them." Nobody objected to this policy at the time, and its practical result was beneficial. Had the same policy been pursued by President Grant in Louisiana that State would have been spared two or three years of angry and needless turmoil. The other case cited by Senator Johnson is equally pertinent. It arose in 1867, General Sheridan being then in military command at New Orleans. His conduct was so insolent and overbearing that it kept the State in hot water, and President Johnson removed him. Under his firm and law-abiding successor, General Hancock, the State was pacified and things went on smoothly during the residue of President Johnson's administration. With this history and these results in his recollection President Grant committed an act of signal indiscretion in sending to New Orleans a commander who, on a former occasion, had

made himself hated and detested by that community, and whose presence tended to rake up old grudges and stir bad blood. In any sound estimate these two precedents and their quieting results are of more value than all the hair-splitting constitutional logic of the democratic speakers, and it would have been an unmanly and fastidious delicacy if Mr. Johnson had foreborne to introduce them lest shallow, carping critics might accuse him of egotism. The sneering ridicule with which partisan wisacres treat Mr. Johnson's professed attachment to the constitution is too contemptible for comment. If he has raised any weak constitutional objections to President Grant's course in Louisiana, let them be exposed and refuted; but it is sheer idiocy or blind political bigotry to turn appeals to the constitution into derision.

In our judgment Mr. Johnson's is the best speech which has been made in this debate. It is strong, plain, practical, and altogether better fitted to make an impression on the average popular mind than the dry arguments of the other speakers. We rejoice that a statesman of Mr. Johnson's great experience, robust honesty, dauntless, political courage, stubborn sense of duty, and independence of party ties, has returned to public life and is in a position where he can command the attention of the country. We are sure to have the opinions of one man who never shrunk from stating his real convictions and cares nothing for paltry political expedients. It is an important accession to our means of learning the truth, for, although no well balanced mind will pin its faith to Andrew Johnson, he is always sure to say something that is worth weighing before we finally make up our minds on public questions. If Mr. Johnson's speech could be widely circulated in Connecticut it would have more influence than all the anti-Grant speeches made on the stump.

The Condition of the Rapid Transit Plan.

Another meeting of the subscribers to the capital stock fund for rapid transit was held yesterday, and the condition of the enterprise is fully set forth in our reports. The labors of the committee have not been altogether useless; new directors have been obtained and additional subscriptions secured. But, while we do not wish to disparage these earnest efforts, we are compelled to say that no important progress has been made. Subscriptions to the amount of a few thousand dollars and promises of assistance hereafter form a sad contrast with the immediate necessities of the enterprise. The scheme is a grand one—millions of dollars are required to execute it. Yet with the proof of what rapid transit has done for London and other great cities, and the knowledge that it has proved not only a public convenience but a financial success, our capitalists continue to be indifferent and inactive. In the meanwhile all the interests of the city—manufacturing, commercial and social—are suffering; capital is departing, and time, which is capital that cannot be restored, is wasted. While we approve the earnest efforts made by the gentlemen who met yesterday we must say that nothing really encouraging has yet been done. The enterprise stands still. Where are the capitalists who should give it their support and redeem the reputation of the community? New York has never had more reason to display her public spirit and less public spirit has never been shown. We want rapid transit, but it must be confessed that we are very slow in getting it.

The Verdict in the Stockwell Case.

The public has not lost its real interest in the Stockwell case, although the excitement has naturally passed away. We remember that a sick and insane man was arrested in the streets on the pretence that he was intoxicated; that he was sent to Blackwell's Island as a vagrant; that when the police authorities were notified of his disappearance they did not identify him, although they had him in custody, and, finally, that, while either in the charge of the police or the prison officials, he received injuries which caused his death. This is enough to arouse the alarm and indignation of the public, and the satisfaction will be universal that the inquest in this case has not ended in the accustomed verdict of "Nobody to blame."

For it appears that there is somebody to blame. The Coroner's charge was a strong one, and the verdict of the jury, after an unusually acute investigation, sustained his review of the evidence. It will be noted that the death of the unfortunate citizen is attributed to want of proper treatment, nourishment and medical aid while he was a prisoner in the station house, in the police court prison and in the Workhouse; that care was not taken by the police, Police Justice Flamm and the officials of Blackwell's Island to ascertain his real condition, and that the whole system now existing under the direction of the Police Board and the Commissioners of Public Charities and Correction is defective, and its management irrational and degrading. The facts forbade any other conclusion, and although the verdict is not severe in its censure of individuals its condemnation of the system under which they act is unqualified.

But this is not enough. The verdict makes further action indispensable. The responsibility of the death of Mr. Stockwell rests upon the men who had charge of him from the hour of his arrest to the hour of his death, and not upon abstractions. Justice to the victim of this wholesale neglect, and the credit and security of our public institutions equally demand that the facts shall be presented to the Grand Jury for such action as it considers necessary. The matter should not drop with the verdict the Coroner's jury has rendered.

THE BECHER TRIAL is rapidly approaching the period when the defendant must take the stand himself. The cross-examination of Bessie Turner was yesterday continued, and to-day Mrs. Morse, another sensational and exciting witness, is expected to make entertainment for the galleries. Mrs. Morse will no doubt be cross-examined upon her letters to Mr. Beecher, upbraiding him for his jokes in the pulpit and his indifference to the sufferings of Mr. Tilton's household.

LYNCH LAW is never justifiable, but if it ever could be justified it would in such cases as that reported from Prince George county, Maryland. Outrages so infamous and horrible infuriate society and cause it to forget its own laws.

A Bullet in the Brain.

It is the fifth day since a bullet weighing half an ounce was lodged in the brain of Mr. Carruth, the Vineland editor, and he is still alive; and this fact is scarcely comprehensible to the many, who conceive the brain as in itself so essentially vital that any injury to it is followed inevitably and almost immediately by death. Indeed, popular knowledge is only divided between the brain and the heart as the essential seats of vitality; and it was a great puzzle to people when, some years ago, a pistol bullet was lodged in the heart of the well known Bill Poole, and that comparatively decent bravo of city politics did not immediately die. In Poole's case the bullet was certainly lodged in the muscular walls of the heart, and it might have been as safe there as in almost any other muscle, if repose and attention had eased the labor of the heart till careful nature could have reinforced the walls and provided against accidents; but an enemy was permitted to enter his room too early—there was a new alteration, an excitement, and, the heart being forced to an untimely energy, the thin septum of muscle that kept the blood in a safe place was broken through, the function of the organ was interfered with and death came. It is just as certain in this case that Carruth's brain is wounded—yet he lives; and people who find that a shot in heart or brain may yet not be fatal, will begin to mistrust their revolvers.

It is not impossible for a man to live with the most serious injury to the brain, and even to live for many years. Every medical museum has specimens which exhibit that life is not necessarily cut short by the presence in the brain of substances presumably as injurious as bullets. In the College Museum at Montpelier, in France, is the skull of a soldier of the First Empire who lived many years with a bullet in his brain, and one can see plainly the evidences of the efforts made by nature, like a skilful engineer, to prevent interference with her ordinary operations. Assisted, perhaps, by some shreds of the internal periosteum, she had constructed a process of bone under the bullet—between it and the brain—and reduced it to the character of a harmless neighbor. In the practice of Dr. Detmold, of this city, we believe there once occurred the case of a man who, in some blasting operations, had a sort of small crow-bar or rock drill driven through his brain—into the head at one side and out at the other—and who recovered from the wound at the time, but died subsequently from its effects by the formation of an abscess and the exhausting drain made by a large pyogenic tract. Cases might be produced in illustration to almost any extent.

Wounds in the brain are fatal immediately, as a rule, by the fact that they open large arteries or that they injure parts essential to the performance of some of the absolutely necessary functions, like respiration; and they are fatal later, by leading to inflammation. Arteries and large veins are so ramified in the brain that it is scarcely possible to shoot into it without inducing extensive hemorrhage, and the blood thus let out from the vessels does not flow away by the wound, but is plugged in by the bullet or by the elasticity of the jelly-like substance, and acts as the same fluid does in case of apoplexy, by pressure and interference with cerebral functions. But it is possible to put in a bullet without opening either any considerable artery or large vein, and without touching the parts of the brain that preside over the operations of animal life. This is, apparently, what has occurred in Carruth's case. He was shot in the back of the head, and the bullet went upward and to the right. It is perhaps lodged against the bone at the summit of the right cerebral hemisphere. Or if it reached that point with the force just short of what was necessary to penetrate it has passed by the inclination of the bone to a point not far from the right eye.

As the man reasons and is conscious the anterior portion of the hemisphere is not greatly injured and is not much, if at all, pressed upon by a clot. It is not probable, therefore, that the arteries near the eye are opened, yet the circulation of the eye is interfered with, as is indicated by the condition of the lid and by the condition of the eye itself, for the optic nerve is not injured, and the loss of sight is due to trouble caused, perhaps, by pressure, and it may be by pressure of the bullet in the immediate vicinity of the orbital chamber. It is possible the man may recover, but, in our opinion, his chances are much lessened by the exclusion of Dr. Gross from the case.

The Transit of Venus.

The astronomical labors of the southern expeditions and those of the imperial party in Japan, as officially chronicled in our columns to-day, are closely analogous, in point of success, to the observations of the other American parties, being neither brilliant victories nor total failures. If the grand object of their researches be not fully accomplished, that can in no way detract from the merit due to the scientists who have engaged in them and the nation whose patronage made victory possible. Many years cannot roll by ere the glorious works of these expeditions will be assigned to due prominence in the annals of the nation. The activity of our social and commercial life may at present preclude a due consideration of their importance, but if it be true that the march of intellect and the achievements of science revolutionize and exalt the human conscience this must be eminently true of the marvellous revelations of astronomy. It has justly been termed the queen of all the physical sciences. Apart from its material benefits to the world of commerce and navigation, there is the sublime spectacle it unfolds of another world as vast, as beautiful as ours, with glowing continents and refulgent seas, with days and seasons and vicissitudes like our own, with a predestined path, which leads the imagination across the universe to grasp the problems of infinite distances. This inestimable science of countless worlds and inconceivable magnitudes, of endless motions and everlasting suns, lifts the mind above all that is terrestrial and points the weeping heart to the mysterious eternity from which it has sprung, and the still more wondrous realm toward which it inevitably moves. Its ennobling influences have been stamped on governments and individuals, and it is recognized in the religious sphere as the handmaid who demonstrates the existence and the glory of an Almighty Power in the universe. Such is

the domain of science in which our country is becoming justly renowned. We confidently anticipate the proportionate consequences thereof, and the practical verification of the lines of the English poet laureate, that

The thoughts of men are widened
In the process of the sun.

Two Distinguished Veterans on the Canal Question.

We publish this morning the present views of two men who have been more intimately and influentially connected with the canal policy of the State than any other two men now living. It so happens that this is to be the great field day in both houses of the Legislature on Governor Tilden's exciting canal message, and as this number of the HERALD will reach Albany before the debate begins we venture to suggest that the members may learn more from our columns than they are likely to gather from the discussion. We direct attention to an interesting interview with Thurlow Weed on this subject, which is qualified to untie "familiar as his garter," and to an abridgement of a report on the canal question just made to the Chamber of Commerce by an old citizen and most able man, Samuel B. Ruggles, who is the greatest master of canal statistics we have ever had in the State, and whose glowing and expansive mind has always clothed these dry bones with flesh and diffused over them a beauty which is almost poetic. One of these respected veterans, Mr. Weed, is seventy-eight years of age, and the other, Mr. Ruggles, is seventy-five; and it may be said of each, as was said of the great Hebrew lawgiver at a still riper age, that "his eye is not dim nor his natural force abated." Each of them has, probably, written more on our State canals than on any other subject—Mr. Weed as an editor at Albany, and Mr. Ruggles in reports, pamphlets and other documents, in which he has expended, we might almost say squandered, the resources of a great intellect, fitted for the higher walks of statesmanship, but, unfortunately for the country, kept out of his proper sphere by the caprices of our politics. It is truly remarkable and a wonderful illustration of the old saying that "politics makes strange bedfellows" that these old whig veterans and collaborators for so many years are found supporting Governor Tilden, whose views and theirs on the canal question were, for thirty years, "wide as the poles asunder." Mr. Tilden, like Silas Wright, Azariah Flagg, Samuel Young and other leaders of the so-called "barnburners," formed the extreme wing on one side of the canal controversy, and Mr. Seward, Mr. Weed and Mr. Ruggles the extreme wing on the other side. Between them was a large section of the democratic party styled, in the political slang of the day, "old hunkers," and led by Dickinson, Bouck and Seymour, Seymour being then a young and rising politician. It is truly remarkable that these extremes meet and we witness so unexpected a spectacle as the support of a "barnburner" Governor on the canal question by the surviving whig leaders. This fact cannot fail to make a great impression both at Albany and throughout the State. It is the strongest moral support Governor Tilden could receive in his bold assault on the Canal Ring.

The canal question was the great bone of party contention in this State during nearly the whole period of Mr. Weed's active career as a party editor and political adviser. There is no other question on which he has bestowed so much vigilance as the chief manager of one of our great parties in this State. After the Canal Ring grew up, and he incurred its hostility, his influence began to decline, and his friends attribute the loss of his old ascendancy more to this cause than any other. None of our public men has had so close a knowledge of the ways of the Canal Ring—none so fully understands its power and its corruption, or is so fully qualified to appreciate the boldness and courage of Governor Tilden, which he warmly applauds.

Mr. Ruggles, quite as able a man in a different way, is altogether lacking in Mr. Weed's practical shrewdness and consummate tact; but he for a long period furnished the canal whigs with their best and brightest ideas on the larger aspects of the canal question. His celebrated canal report in 1838 was treated as a sort of canonical scripture on this subject so long as the enlargement controversy lasted. It was impossible to listen to a canal dispute in the remotest hamlet of the State without hearing perpetual reference to "Ruggles' Report," one side extolling it to the skies and the other decrying it with equal vigor. In more recent years he has been the "guide, philosopher and friend" of our Chamber of Commerce on all questions connected with transportation. The report of which we publish an epitome this morning was made to that body at its request, and is full of valuable information bearing on the present state of the canal question. We advise members of the Legislature to send to the Chamber of Commerce for copies of the unabridged report, as they will learn infinitely more from it than they will ever gather by their unassisted researches. It, however, indorses and fortifies the canal policy recommended by Governor Tilden in his annual Message, rather than his more recent war on the Canal Ring, which was not declared until this report had been nearly completed. Governor Tilden is to be congratulated on the support of these distinguished veterans and former opponents.

John Mitchell.

The Irish societies of this and the neighboring cities have resolved to mark their appreciation of the services rendered by Mr. Mitchell to the cause of Irish independence by a parade in honor of his memory on next Sunday. It is, perhaps, fitting that such a mode of testifying the estimate in which his life-long services are held should be adopted by his countrymen. But while honoring the dead they should not forget the living. It is impossible to call back the dead, but we may propitiate their manes by protecting and aiding those whom they loved better than themselves. Mitchell devoted himself in life to the service of his country with no thought of personal gain. He occupied himself so much with Ireland that he had not time to make for his family the ample provision they had a right to expect from his social position and brilliant talents. Had he devoted his talents to the service of his family he would undoubtedly have left them rich. It would be a graceful and appropriate tribute

to his memory for the people in whose cause he labored to come now to the aid of his stricken family. His daughter and his widow should be offered a substantial tribute of the affection of the Irish people for John Mitchell. And if the men who will throng our streets on Sunday would only make each one, an offering of one dollar in grateful remembrance of John Mitchell's services, those whom the dead patriot loved most upon earth would be placed in a position of easy independence. This would be a practical way of honoring Mitchell's memory, and better than a thousand parades.

Are Church Bells a Nuisance?

Alderman Billings offered a resolution recently declaring church bells a nuisance and forbidding them to be rung for more than ten minutes previous to each service. We congratulate the Aldermen that they have so completely reformed the city that it only remains to put the last finishing touches to their work by silencing "the sound of the church-going bells," as if they were vulgar noise like the din and roar of traffic in our streets. Even the sick and the dying seldom feel disturbed by the sound of church bells, they awaken so many pleasant or sacred associations and remembrances. Well people who complain must have very weak